

REMARKS

Claim Disposition

Claims 1-24 are pending in the application. The Examiner has rejected claims 1-24. Claims 1, 15 and 23 have been amended, leaving Claims 1-24 for consideration upon entry of the current amendments.

Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 15-16 and 23-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Petite U.S. Patent No. 7,103,511 B2 hereinafter referred to as "Petite".

Claims 15 and 23 have been amended to include a limitation that *configuration information stored in the producer device that is independent of configuration information stored in any other producer device*. The Examiner has pointed out that Petite does not disclose *one of the plurality of producer devices having configuration information that can be different than the configuration information in another of the plurality of producer devices*. It therefore stands to reason that Petite does not allow the producer devices to have configuration information that is independent of other producer devices. As such, this claimed element of Claims 15 and 23 is not disclosed by Petite. Applicants, therefore, respectfully request withdrawal of the anticipation rejections of Claims 15 and 23.

Claims 16 and 24 are directly dependent upon Claims 15 and 23 respectively and as such include all of the limitations of the claims from which they are dependent; therefore, rejections thereof should be withdrawn as well.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-14 and 17-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Petite in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,133,907 B2 to Carlson, et al (hereinafter "Carlson"). Applicants respectfully traverse.

Claim 1 has been amended to include a limitation that the producer devices store configuration information without a common database of configuration information. Although,

as the Examiner has pointed out, Petite has several site controllers and each site controller contains configuration information, it should be noted that all of the site controllers of Petite contain the *same* configuration information and as such they have a common database of configuration information. Petite describes this common database in column 17, lines 53-60: *“After mapping the wireless communication devices, the site controller 150 develops and maintains a database that includes the unique address for each wireless communication device, the number of transceiver/repeaters 125 in the downstream path, the address of each transceiver/repeater 125 in the downstream path, the upstream addresses, and the downstream addresses.”* And further in column 15, lines 58-64: *“In addition to orchestrating communications with the wireless communication devices, the site controller 150 maintains current databases of information regarding the automated monitoring system 100, such as, for example, the function of the wireless communication devices, the unique address for each of the wireless communication devices, and current data contained in response messages.”* Petite, therefore, having a common database does not disclose the element of Claim 1 of a system without a common database.

Similarly, Carlson also has a common database of configuration information. In fact, the common database is a major feature of Carlson as described in column 5, lines 28-34: *The lookup service 110 maintains registered service objects 114, including a lookup service proxy object 116, that enables network users, such as the administrator UI 104, elements 106, service configuration policies 108 and resource APIs 126 to access the lookup service 110...* Carlson, therefore, does not cure this deficiency of Petite and as such the combination of Petite and Carlson cannot together cure the deficiency either. As such, Applicants respectfully request the withdrawal of the obviousness rejection of Claim 1.

Claims 2-14 and 17-22 are either directly or indirectly dependent upon Claims 1 or 15 and as such include all of the limitations of the claim from which they are dependent. Claims 1 and 15 are allowable over the cited references for at least the reasons given above and the dependent Claims 2-14 and 17-22 are also allowable over these same references for at least these reasons.

Conclusion

It is believed that the foregoing remarks are fully responsive to the Office Action and that the claims herein should be allowable to the Applicants. In the event the Examiner has any queries regarding the instantly submitted response, the undersigned respectfully request the courtesy of a telephone conference to discuss any matters in need of attention.

If there are any additional charges with respect to this Response or otherwise, please charge them to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Respectfully Submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By: 

Daniel A. Gilmour

Registration No. 59,059

55 Griffin Road South

Bloomfield, CT 06002

Telephone: (860) 286-2929

Facsimile: (860) 286-0115

Customer No. 23413

Date: October 26, 2007